

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 13, 2003. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8-11 and 15-21 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. It is to be noted that the claim changes do not narrow the scope of any claim element, do not add any new claim element, merely clarify what was already being claimed, and are related only tangentially to patentability. Claims 1, 8 and 15 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The specification has been amended to add a reference character, which is also to be added to Fig. 3. A corrected version of Fig. 5 is also submitted. These changes are believed to respond fully to the objections made to the drawings.

Claims 2, 9 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. These claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the point raised in the Office Action. It is believed that these claims comply fully with Section 112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of the rejection under that Section is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5-8, 12-15 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Japanese Kokai 10-042068 A (Yasumoto et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,438,605 B1 (Idehara), Claims 2, 9 and 16 as being obvious from those documents, further in view of European Patent Application 812,100 A2 (Ishibashi et al.), and Claims 23, 4, 10, 11, 17 and 18, as being obvious from *Yasumoto* and *Idehara* in view of Japanese Kokai 10-126600 A (Yazaki).

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a communication apparatus including means for connecting to a public communication line, a scanner for reading an image, means for converting the image read by said scanner to have a predetermined format, and means for executing a process to send to a server connected to the public communication line in a case where it is necessary to send the converted image as an electronic mail to the Internet. The apparatus also comprises means for registering a facsimile number of a destination to which the image should be sent, for an abbreviation number, and means for registering an electronic mail address of the destination for the same abbreviation number. Also provided in the apparatus are a key corresponding to the abbreviation number, a key representing facsimile sending, and a key representing electronic mail sending, as well as means for executing the facsimile sending of the read image to the registered facsimile number in a case where the key representing the facsimile sending is depressed pursuant to depression of the key corresponding to the abbreviation number, and means for executing the electronic mail sending of the read image to the registered electronic mail address in a case where the key representing the electronic mail sending is depressed pursuant to depression of the key corresponding to the abbreviation number.

Yasumoto relates to communication terminal equipment in which either a telephone member or an E-mail address can be registered in one one-touch key, and FAX communication or E-mail communication is executed when one-touch dialing is selected, according as the telephone member or the E-mail address has been registered. Any given abbreviation number, however, will apparently represent only a telephone number, or only an e-mail address.

Idehara relates to communication equipment in which information on a communication route available at a partner station is received from the partner station by communication with the partner station via a telephone line without using an abbreviation member.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found, or pointed out, in either of these references that would indicate or suggest that both a telephone number and an E-mail address can be registered in one abbreviation number, as is recited in Claim 1. Even if these documents are combined in the manner proposed (and even assuming that such combination would be permissible), the result would not meet the terms of Claim 1, in that the result would not have any single abbreviation number to which a telephone number and an e-mail address are both registered.

A fortiori, these documents, even if combined, cannot teach or suggest an arrangement in which that actuation of such an abbreviation-number key, and either a fax key or an e-mail key, would suffice to perform fax communication or e-mail communication, respectively, as recited in Claim 1.

For all these reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Yasumoto* and *Idehara*, taken separately or together.

Independent Claim 8 is directed to a communication method in a communication apparatus that includes means for connecting to a public communication line, a scanner for reading an image, a means for converting the image read by the scanner to have a predetermined format, and a means for executing a process to send to a server connected to the public communication line in a case where it is necessary to send the converted image as an electronic mail to the Internet. According to Claim 8, the method

comprises registering a facsimile number of a destination to which the image should be sent, for an abbreviation number, and registering an electronic mail address of the destination for the same abbreviation number. Claim 8 also recites executing facsimile sending of the read image to the registered facsimile number in a case where a key representing the facsimile sending is depressed pursuant to depression of a key corresponding to the abbreviation number, and executing electronic mail sending of the read image to the registered electronic mail address in a case where a key representing the electronic mail sending is depressed pursuant to depression of the key corresponding to the abbreviation number.

Thus, Claim 8 is believed to be allowable over *Yasumoto* and *Idehara* for the same reasons as argued above in connection with Claim 1.

Independent Claim 15 is a computer memory medium claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Leonard P. Diana
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 389346 v1